|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Tables S1: Quality assessment of the included study with New Castle-Ottawa Quality Assessment Scale** | | | | | | | | |
| **Study** | **Represent-ativeness of exposed cohort** | **Selection of non-exposed cohort** | **Ascertain- ment of exposure** | **Demonstration that outcome of interest was not present at start of study** | **Comparability of cohorts on the basis of the design or analysis** | **Assessment of outcome** | **Was follow-up long enough for outcomes to occur** | **Adequacy of follow up completion of cohorts** |
| Blum 2007 | \* |  | \* | \* |  | \* | \* | \* |
| Blum 2012 | \* |  | \* | \* |  | \* | \* | \* |
| Ganguly 2013 | \* |  | \* | \* |  | \* | \* | \* |
| Garcia-Manero 2006 | \* |  | \* | \* |  | \* | \* | \* |
| Halpern 2014 | \* |  | \* | \* |  | \* | \* | \* |
| Hao 2014 | \* |  | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* |
| Jiang 2015 | \* |  | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* |
| Kirschbaum 2014 | \* |  | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* |
| Liesveld 2013 | \* |  | \* | \* |  | \* | \* | \* |
| Mims 2018 | \* |  | \* | \* |  | \* | \* | \* |
| Mupiddi 2015 | \* |  | \* | \* |  | \* | \* | \* |
| Phillips 2013 | \* |  | \* | \* |  | \* | \* | \* |
| Ritchie 2013 | \* |  | \* | \* |  | \* | \* | \* |
| Schroeder 2018 | \* |  | \* | \* |  | \* | \* | \* |
| Sun 2015 | \* |  | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* |
| Welch 2014 | \* |  | \* | \* |  | \* | \* | \* |
| Willemze 1993 | \* |  | \* | \* |  | \* | \* | \* |
| Willemze 1997 | \* |  | \* | \* |  | \* | \* | \* |
| William 2013 | \* |  | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* |
| Zhang 2016 | \* |  | \* | \* |  | \* | \* | \* |
| Zhao 2017 | \* |  | \* | \* |  | \* | \* | \* |
| Zhou 2016 | \* |  | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* |
| **CRITERIA** | | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Selection** | **Comparability** | **Outcome** |
| 1) Representativeness of the exposed cohort  a) truly representative of the average \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ (describe) in the community ****  b) somewhat representative of the average \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ in the community ****  c) selected group of users e.g. nurses, volunteers  d) no description of the derivation of the cohort  2) Selection of the non-exposed cohort  a) drawn from the same community as the exposed cohort ****  b) drawn from a different source  c) no description of the derivation of the non-exposed cohort  3) Ascertainment of exposure  a) secure record (e.g. surgical records) ****  b) structured interview ****  c) written self-report  d) no description  4) Demonstration that outcome of interest was not present at start of study  a) yes ****  b) no | 1) Comparability of cohorts on the basis of the design or analysis  a) study controls for \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ (select the most important factor) ****  b) study controls for any additional factor **** (This criterion could be modified to indicate specific control for a second important factor.) | 1) Assessment of outcome  a) independent blind assessment ****  b) record linkage ****  c) self-report  d) no description  2) Was follow-up long enough for outcomes to occur  a) yes (select an adequate follow up period for outcome of interest) ****  b) no  3) Adequacy of follow up of cohorts  a) complete follow up - all subjects accounted for ****  b) subjects lost to follow up unlikely to introduce bias - small number lost - > \_\_\_\_ % (select an adequate %) follow up, or description provided of those lost) ****  c) follow up rate < \_\_\_\_% (select an adequate %) and no description of those lost  d) no statement |

Note: A study can be awarded a maximum of one star for each numbered item within the Selection and Outcome categories. A maximum of two stars can be given for Comparability